Team 1, Group 3

Proposed Coordination Strategies for Air Quality, Land Use, Energy, Transportation and Climate

May 18, 2006

Group 3 Participants

- Lisa Gomez, Sempra (Co-chair)
- Chris Stoneman, EPA (Co-chair)
- John Atcheson, DOE
- Michael Bradley, MJB & Assoc.
- Greg Dana, AAM
- Tony DeLucia, ETSU
- Jeff Genzer, NASEO
- Pam Giblin, Baker Botts
- Larry Greene, Sacramento AQMD
- Stephen Hartsfield, NTEC
- Sharon Kneiss, AFP&A
- Jerry Kotas, DOE
- Matt Kuryla, Baker Botts
- Mark MacLeod, ED
- Camille Mittelholtz, DOT
- Mark Morford, Stoel Rives
- Gerald Roussel, Ford
- Steve Winkelman, CCAP
- Debbie Wood, EPA

Group 3 Charge

- “Propose ways in which the AQM framework of the future should coordinate with other programs such as land use, energy, transportation and climate.”

Status of Recommendations

- **Group consensus:**
  - Recommendations 2 through 7
- **Ongoing discussions:**
  - Recommendation 1
  - Recommendation 8

Recommendation 2

- **Background:**
  - Multi-jurisdictional planning organizations and tribal and local governments ("Local Governments") have primary control and authority over land use choices that impact air quality, transportation, energy and greenhouse gases
  - Local Governments have a unique opportunity to coordinate these interests
  - Local Governments, therefore, should be an integral part of AQM process

Recommendation 2

- **Recommendations:**
  - 2.A. – Provide time and resources to enable Local Governments to better understand the impact of their decisions
    - Link up governments that are actively implementing integrated planning approaches
    - Develop clearinghouse of planning resources and tools (e.g., modeling software, model codes and guidebooks)
  - 2.B. – Encourage Local Governments to conduct visioning and scenario planning
    - Partner with DOT to conduct pilot transportation and land use scenario analyses

Recommendation 2

- **Recommendations (cont.):**
  - 2.C. – Explore the advantages of mandatory visioning and scenario planning
    - Partner with DOT to conduct pilot transportation and land use scenario analyses
  - 2.D. – Provide appropriate SIP/TIP credit for local actions that further air quality objectives
    - E.g., guidance on getting full credit for land use measures
- **Scenario:** 1

Recommendation 3

- **Background:**
  - The AQM process should include incentives for voluntary and innovative land use, energy and transportation technologies or approaches
    - E.g., SIP/TIP credit, regulatory incentives, economic incentives, etc.
  - Many stakeholders are not aware of incentives that EPA has already developed

Recommendation 3

- **Recommendations:**
  - 3.A. - Develop communication strategy for programs that already exist (Group 4)
  - 3.B. - Develop new programs that motivate voluntary and innovative measures (Team 2)
  - 3.C. - Establish meaningful SIP/TIP credit
- **Scenario:** Depends on strategy/tool

Recommendation 4

- **Background:**
  - Land use, transportation, energy and air quality policies are inextricably intertwined
  - Federal agencies should better coordinate their efforts on these issues
  - There's precedent for such coordination
    - Interagency Regulatory Liaison Group

Recommendation 4

- **Recommendation:**
  - Establish an interagency liaison group with other federal agencies (e.g., DOE, NRC, FERC, DOT)
  - Group should use MOU or other means to establish purpose/activities
  - Group should explore opportunities for coordination and alignment of federal agency goals and objectives
- **Scenario:** 1

Recommendation 5

- **Background:**
  - The current AQM system has not adequately addressed the significant emission reductions that may be achieved by encouraging the public to reduce polluting activities or pursue less polluting alternatives

Recommendation 5

- **Recommendations:**
  - 5.A. – Social marketing and outreach strategy (e.g., education, labeling programs) (Group 4)
  - 5.B. – Evaluate options for discouraging nonessential activities and encouraging less polluting activities (Team 2)
    - E.g., education, taxes, fees, use restrictions, economic incentives, expedited or streamlined permitting
- **Scenario:** Depends on strategy/tool

Recommendation 6

- **Background:**
  - Several statutes directly or indirectly address energy efficiency (EE) and renewable energy (RE)
  - EE/RE measures
    - could reduce multiple emissions
    - may be more cost-effective than command & control strategies
    - may accomplish various public policy goals (e.g., air quality, homeland security, energy security)
  - Federal government has not taken full advantage of opportunities to further EE/RE measures

Recommendation 6

- **Recommendations:**
  - 6.A. – Examine
    - existing laws to determine extent to which they authorize pollution prevention strategies through RE/EE measures
    - cost-effectiveness of such strategies compared to command-and-control strategies
    - opportunities for pollution prevention-based approaches, both with and without legislative/regulatory change, where such approaches would be more effective from cost- or performance-perspectives
  - 6.B. – Identify and delineate prevention-based strategies that achieve national goals and/or allow ancillary GHG emission reductions with little or no net cost
- **Scenario:** 1

Recommendation 7

- **Background:**
  - August 2004 EPA issued guidance to encourage clean energy/air quality integration
  - Window of opportunity for inclusion of EE/RE measures in SIPs
    - 8-hr ozone and PM2.5 SIPs due in next 2 yrs
  - Yet, to date, only one EE/RE measure approved
  - Limited precedents under August 2004 guidance create obstacles to aggressive adoption of EE/RE measures in SIPs/TIPs

Recommendation 7

- **Recommendations:**
  - 7.A. –Determine and resolve actual and perceived barriers to clean energy/air quality integration
  - 7.B. – Facilitate/mediate resolution of policy issues and encourage EE/RE measures in SIPs/TIPs
  - 7.C. – Provide outreach on interface between CAIR and EE/RE measures
  - 7.D. – Work through SIP/TIP issues using sample EE/RE control measures

Recommendation 7

- **Recommendations (cont.):**
  - 7.E. – Make funding information available on web (e.g., timing, eligibility, amounts, etc.)
  - 7.F. – Identify innovative financing strategies (e.g., performance contracting laws, tax incentives)
- **Scenario:** 1 (except 7.F. may be 1, 2 or 3 depending on financing scheme)

Recommendation 8

- **Background**
  - **Group 3 Charge:** "Propose ways in which the AQM framework of the future should coordinate with other programs such as land use, energy, transportation ***and climate***."
  - **"Dallas Compromise"**

"Dallas Compromise"

- **Group may pursue:**
  - recommendations focused on information gathering and coordination
  - recommendations that recognize, without undermining, various climate initiatives underway at state and local levels
- **Group may not pursue:**
  - recommendations that mandate or advance climate change policy
  - recommendations that give EPA a preemptive or preeminent role in climate change programs or policies

Recommendation 8

- **Discussion**
  - Goals/Objectives
  - Considerations/Comparisons
    - NAS Report
    - AQM Phase I Recommendations
    - Existing EPA activities
    - “Dallas Compromise”
  - Open Discussion

Recommendation 8

- **Background:**
  - Need AQM system that anticipates impact of rising temperatures on air quality
  - Many cities and states are promoting actions to reduce GHG emissions
  - Many cities and states are interested in integrating state/local air quality planning with climate programs
  - Throughout 1990s, EPA assisted states with GHG inventories, but this effort has declined, resulting in outdated inventories

Recommendation 8

- **Recommendations:**
  - 8.A. - Assist states and localities in quantifying the potential for GHG co-benefits and disbenefits of emission reduction measures primarily designed to address ozone, PM2.5, regional haze and toxics (AQM Phase I Recommendation)
  - 8.B. - Assess implications (including cost) of climate change on future air quality objectives (e.g., impacts of temperature increases on ozone and impacts of secondary effects on air quality)

Recommendation 8

- **Recommendations (cont.):**
  - 8.C. - Assist states in development of GHG inventories
    - Finalize Emission Inventory Improvement Program
    - Provide technical assistance
- **Scenario:** 1

Recommendation 8

- **Discussion**
  - Considerations/Comparisons
    - NAS Report
    - AQM Phase I Recommendations
    - Existing EPA activities
    - “Dallas Compromise”
  - Open Discussion